

From: Charlotte Zajac [<mailto:whalecar@sbcglobal.net>]
Sent: Thursday, March 13, 2008 9:04 PM
To: MLPACComments
Subject: mlpa rationale

I came up with a couple of more concerns about the process. It seems as though yet another group of people have had their rights trashed by these bio babbling do-gooders. Although I am not a Native American, I wonder how they feel at having their traditional food gathering practices terminated by this group? How is it that after a thousand years of harmonious existence in the natural world, a group claiming to know more about the ecosystem comes along and wants to deny people their cultural identity, heritage, and ability to live in harmony and harvest sustainable amounts of seafood from the ocean? Shame on those who have created this travesty, overstepped their policing boundaries, denying peoples right to fish, and have used private money to pad their coffers. Who are these new comers who claim to own the ocean? This is nuts and the Californians need to shove this flawed law back whence it came from. All of these important sounding groups have supported a process so flawed, without private funding it would have crumbled.

Now some common sense, please. By eliminating access to areas of the coast to sport fishermen, mostly abalone divers, you are losing a critical line of defense against poaching. Abalone are worth 70 to 100 dollars apiece on the black market and the incentive is there, and many poaching rings have been eliminated through tips to F&G by sport fishermen who are the eyes and ears on this vast and remote coast. By closing areas to sport fishermen, you are losing this defense, and opening options for organized poaching in an area with few wardens. This is profoundly stupid, but common sense hasn't presented itself during the project to date. I have been through hundreds of hours of MPA meetings and they blab on and on about the socio-economic impacts of MPA's on the locals, as if the social impacts, and economic impacts should be lumped into one idiotic word when, in fact they represent two very complex and different ideas which need to be addressed individually through interviews with the people who live on the coast, are most affected, and will lose their livelihoods. And no, a cute girl with a survey isn't good enough. The process could care less about fishing families and although we have heard tons about the impacts we have seen zero mitigating action. Repeatedly these issues were brought up during stakeholder meetings and were ignored throughout.

The problem lies in the elitists who want to close everything, have controlled the media, created a hysteria about take, and have carefully dodged all of the real issues like pollution, agribusiness and river degradation. The conservation groups who lead these processes are often headed by biologists who see human consumptive use of the ocean as a negative thing.

Their main focus, it seems, is to eliminate fishermen from the most productive areas. The California Sea Lion population has gone from an est. 27,000 20 years ago to an est. 500,000 today. Sea lions chase migrating salmon up rivers and eat them before they can spawn. Dams with fish ladders have created an "all you can eat" situation where salmon are ambushed at the ladder openings. Salmon stocks are at an all time low, and this is a serious problem. The sea Lion population is maxed

out, but when one gets ill, a troop of well-meaning animal rescue people, usually visionary house wives, rush in to rehabilitate the animal. This overwhelming instinct is triggered by the mammalian connection, seals have mammary glands, soft brown eyes, and create pups. What we have now, is an imbalance in the Calif. sea lion population, and a salmon population in dire straights. The two species can co-exist, but a balance must be maintained. If the public is now going to be part regulating ocean systems, they must be made aware of these problems, however sensitive they are. Imagine if some of this money were spent saving salmon!

Crazy data.

The biologists, in their zeal to close areas, bring absurd data to the process. Joell Buffa, manager of the M, F, N, W, R claims there were 1,000,000s of seabirds and hundreds of thousands of marine mammals before 'human exploitation the Farallon Islands. This, I presume, was prior to 1909 when the refuge was established. I just wonder who counted all of these animals, or are these "rabbit out of a hat" statistics? She claim that boat traffic disturbs a stellar seal breeding colony, but common sense tells us that Calif. sea lions have out-competed their northern neighbors, are better adapted to southern breeding, and are probably the leading cause of their next of kins reduced numbers. This non-sensical use of statistics to close areas to human use has been rampant throughout the MPA process. At early meetings, I begged for money, so some un-biased research could be conducted on the areas in question, but was denied. Many of these biologists want no fishing so that sea lion populations will reach their maximum sustainable population densities. Exploding populations will only slow down after they have eaten everything and begin to starve. Like the elk herds in Yellowstone, the ecosystem can only support so many large animals. While I enjoy all marine animals, we cannot allow the mammary gland syndrome to steer this process. Thankfully, white shark populations seem to be on the rise, and may help the situation.

The MPA process has been a destruction of Native American rights, a destruction of public rights, a destruction of commercial rights, and is possibly unlawful. It has ignored the social impact on a food gathering populace and their heritage and has ignored the economic impacts it has on peoples businesses. It has used unsound science presented by conservation groups who want to claim areas of historic abundance for themselves to the detriment and exclusion of others. It has weakened the protection against poaching on the coast afforded by sportsmen. It denies the right of humans to gather food in a sustainable manner and to co-exist within their habitat. It's public outreach program has been a sham, and should be declared a failure. It has used private money and to strip resources away from fragile coastal economies. One MLPA goal was education, but these groups have excluded fishing as part of their curriculum. Why is this? As a part of our history and heritage, why is it excluded?

If protecting the environment was an MLPA goal, why did the BRTF choose areas of clean water and high fish and invertebrate abundance over areas like the SF bay delta system, which really need help now? With many species in the delta facing extinction, you chose the Farralones, an island 30 miles away teeming with pinnipeds, seabirds and fish. This is because the self-serving conservation groups don't want any part of the real issues of polluting oil refineries, sewage, water diversions, salmon

declines, agricultural wastes and storm water effluent. No, they want pristine areas to do their research in and not be bothered by those disgusting things called people. The unsuspecting public will find out soon enough that they may have to pay a fee to enjoy areas which were once free. The fee to see elephant seals was 14\$ and I remember when someone in the system got their proboscis into the funds and was embezzling the money.

The Feds.

Now that we have established all of these fences across the ocean, enforcement has become an issue. The solution? My boat has just been outfitted with a GPS sex-offender style tracking device, which I had to pay 590\$ for, plus a 40\$ per month user fee to fund my own monitoring. Fair enough, although I am no sex offender, and to my knowledge, neither is my boat. With high restrictions, fuel prices, berthing and maintenance fees this seems like an unnecessary infringement on my freedom. What is more, I suspect the information gathered from my hard work will be used to close more areas to fishing, although they will deny this. While I get at 4 in the morning and go out and find areas to fish, you stay in a warm office and map out the next areas for closure because I went out and found some fish there, ok! This tracking device puts a constant drain on my batteries representing a serious safety concern. You will never see me pleading with the BRTF because the basic concept may be unconstitutional. I wish there were more people who would refuse to be herded like sheep over a cliff. If MPAS are shoved down our throats, at least they could have taken on threatened and degraded habitats, but they chose not to. Prior to 1900 millions of salmon migrated up the Sacramento river system, whose mouth is only 30 miles from the Farallones, so why not restore their former abundance? I'll tell you why. It's because you would have had to face the big oil refineries, agribusiness, invasive species issues and sewage spill problems just to name a few. So far everything that has been done has been chicken----, and you have chosen to step into the ring with the fishing community because they are practically politically defenseless. How big of you!

Concerned Person.

christian zajac